85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

- Speaker McPike: "The House will come to order. The Chaplain for today is Reverend Carl Marshall of the Lake Ridge Christain Church in Paris, Illinois. The Reverend Marshall is the guest of Representative Weaver. The guests in the balcony may wish to rise and join us for the invocation this morning."
- Reverend Carl Marshall: "Our Father God, we are grateful for this day and for the beauty that it gives to us as well as the opportunities that it gives to us to serve You. Help us, we pray, as we go and deliberate during this day, that those who assemble here, may seek Your wisdom, for Your wisdom can give us truth and light, so that we might do that which is more pleasing to You, and thus of greater service to one another. Guide them in their deliberations, and keep them always in Your care, is our prayer in Jesus' name. Amen."
- Speaker McPike: "We will be led in the Pledge of Allegiance by Monroe Flinn."
- Flinn et al: "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."
- Speaker McPike: "Roll Call for Attendance. Representative Kubik."
- Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Republicans have no absences today."
- Speaker McPike: "Thank you, and the Democrats have no excused absences. Mr. Clerk, take the roll. One hundred and eighteen Members answering the Roll Call, and a quorum is present. Committee report."
- Clerk McLennand: "Committee Report. Committee on Rules has met and pursuant to Rule 14(a)6, Bills referred pursuant to

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Rule 27, 37, 46, 1, rules recommends consideration and the Bills will be placed on the Order of Amendatory Compliance. House Bills 659, 1377 and 1451 and 2375. Amendatory Noncompliance, House Bills 256, 293, 392, 771, 935, 1029, 1077, 1155, 1162, 1256, 1542, 1687, 1816. House Bills 1974, 2105, 2168, 2307, and 2397, and pursuant to Rule 14(a)6, Bills referred, rules recommends consideration and the Bills are to be placed on the Order of First Reading. Senate Bill 868. Second Reading, Senate Bills 87, 95, 433, 450, 485, 684, 766, 1024. Nonconcurrence, Senate Bill 240. In Conference, Senate Bill 707, offered this day by Frank Giglio, Chairman, Committee on Rules."

Speaker McPike: "Introductions - First Reading."

Clerk McLennand: "Introduction and First Reading of House Bills.

House Bill 2510, offered by Representative Black, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Controlled Substances Act.

House Bill 2511, offered by Representative Dunn, a Bill for an Act to amend the Liquor Control Act. First Reading of these House Bills. First Reading of House Bills. House Bill 2512, offered by Representative Saltsman, a Bill for an Act to amend the Illinois Pension Code. House Bill 2513, offered by Representative Hoeft, a Bill for an Act to amend the School Code. First Reading of these House Bills."

Speaker McPike: "It's the Chair's intention to go through Total

Veto Motions one time and a Supplemental Calendar will be
out shortly, and it's the Chair's intention to go through
the Supplemental one time and then adjourn. Total Veto
Motions on Page 6 of the Calendar. Representative Currie.
Representative Currie has taken it out of the record, and
we will not return to these. All right, Representative
Currie. House Bill 317."

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House..."

Speaker McPike: "I think it's fair to make a presumption that the Republican Senate will support the Republican Governor in these Veto Motions, so it's not the intent of the Chair to listen to two hours of debate on these. It's the intent of the Chair to listen to one person for the Veto Override, one person against the Veto Override, because the Chair feels that the Senate is going to spend a lot less time on that Motion then we would. So proceed, Representative Currie."

Currie: "Thank you, Speaker and Members of the House. The measure the Governor vetoed is one that would marginally expand the Senior Citizen Property Tax Deferral Program so that it would be available to more senior citizens who are today being forced out of their homes because they unable to pay the property tax bill. The underlying program as you will remember, is not a program that costs the state money. This is a program under which individuals are permitted to borrow to pay their property taxes. The state is repaid the principal, the total amount of the property tax bill, with 6% interest at the time the senior citizens house is sold. Very few people today participate in the program. In my view, part of the reason for that low rate of participation is the fact that the income threshold is a very meager \$14,000 in annual income. measure proposes to increase the threshold to \$25,000 in annual income, because of inflation over the 20 or so years since the program has been in place. The \$25,000 figure is the threshold of \$14,000 when the program was closer to first instituted, than \$14,000 per year means Governor's cost estimate of this Bill of the initial costs, think, are wildly exaggerated. I hope you will join me,

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

the Taxpayers Federation of Illinois, senior citizen groups across the state, and many school districts as well, in restoring the measure we adopted unanimously last spring and seeing to it that the senior citizens in our neighborhoods who are being pushed out of their homes by high property taxes, have the opportunity to stay at home and ultimately return those dollars to the state's coffers. I'd appreciate your support for this Override Motion."

Speaker McPike: "No one is standing in opposition to the Lady's Motion. The question is, 'Shall House Bill 317 pass. Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote 'ave'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 109 'ayes' 'nays', and this Motion having received the three-fifths Majority is adopted, and House Bill 317 is hereby declared passed, the Veto of the Governor House Bill 383, Representative Salvi. notwithstanding. Mr. Salvi. You're up, Sir. You're up. All right, not...I'm not going to return to this. You call it now or that's it. We're going home today. This is it. A11 right, out of the record. Representative Prussing, on 467. Representative Prussing. You want this called at all? All right, out of the record. House Bill 1239, Representative Morrow. Charles Morrow. House Bill 1295, Representative Giglio. House Bill 1526, Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Fifteen twenty six is the Bill that passed both Houses and what it does, it prohibits any person from transporting or accepting grease from off-site treatment disposal plants, and bringing them into a place where they accept them without having a license. The Governor saw fit

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

to veto this because he claims he doesn't want to put a mandate on local governments. Well, local governments are going to get \$250 for the license and I don't see...while the Governor accepted what the Municipal League tried to do and convince him to veto this Bill. The Bill had a very good hearing when it was put out, and if anybody's concerned about the environment and disposing this grease that we get from these businesses and from these big restaurants, will...help me override this Veto, and I would ask for your support."

Speaker McPike: "All right, on the Motion, Representative Black." Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I urge you to vote 'no' on this override for some very simple reasons. The idea is not without some merit, but I think the Gentleman, in all due respect to him, has a problem in his district and so we're going to react to that difficulty by making this a statewide Every small business in the state...your ma and pa restaurant, the coffee shops that you go to in the morning to find out what your constituents think, will be burdened by this very onerous statewide requirement, don't kid yourself, that fee that the Gentleman talks about will be passed on to the owner of that small restaurant who will have to fill out a myriad of paperwork to dispose of grease trapped sludge. The Governor's Veto Message is governments already have this authority if There is no reason to put they choose to use it. unfunded state mandate on the backs of small business owners who are already overburdened by such costs. Ι a no vote. Uphold the Veto and protect your small business owners and operators and small restaurant operators back home. They would appreciate your 'no' vote."

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1526 pass,
the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor
vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Skinner to
explain his vote."

Skinner: "It doesn't look like it's necessary, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 42 'ayes' and 68 'noes', and the Motion fails. Representative Dart, 2080. House Bill 2080, Mr. Dart."

Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we override the Governor's Veto on 2080. This is rather simple straight forward Bill. It's not a mandate. It's basically a truth in taxation Bill, which is...taxing districts must hold a public hearing as it exists now to adopt a levy. House Bill 2080 simply standardizes the days these hearings must be held. It's a rather straight forward Bill. The notice requirements are already in the statute, and I would move to override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kubik on the Motion."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I would rise in opposition to the Motion. I don't House. think there's anybody in this House who's opposed to truth in taxation. Unfortunately, I think this Bill has a number of major problems with it. The first of which, it mandate, no matter the Sponsor's well intentions notwithstanding. It is a mandate. There is no way of paying for this mandate. I might point out also, that I think that the original Bill had some real problems with respect to when these truth in taxation hearings were held. They would have this schedule of hearings on the weekends, so we would have a situation where a number of units would

# 85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

have truth in taxation hearings on a Sunday, which frankly, I don't think makes a whole lot of sense. There's a lot of minor technical problems with this legislation. I think the Gentleman has put forth a good idea. I don't think the idea's time has come. We need to work on this Bill and there...for those of you specifically who are worried about the cost of mandates on local government, this clearly is a mandate, and we ought to defeat this Motion."

- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 2080 pass,
  the Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor
  vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Levin. One
  minute."
- Levin: "Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this override. Yes, it's a mandate for tax caps; it's a mandate for local governments to keep their taxes down. That's what this is intended to do is to protect the taxpayer by providing more notice and more hearings in terms of increases, they're going to cost the taxpayer more money. I urge more 'green' votes for this override on behalf of the taxpayers of this state."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Wennlund to explain your vote."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This initiative was proposed for Cook County only by the assessor, Thomas Hinds, and it really doesn't address the real problem in Cook County which is double digit increases in the assessments. The levies aren't the problems in Cook County. This Veto should be sustained."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Mr. Black."
- Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just to explain my vote. This is a classic example of going hunting for mosquitoes with a baseball bat. This Bill says that if any

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

increase in the proposed aggregate levy over the previous year's levy is...happens, then you have to have a hearing. That hearing could be less...for less than a 1% levy. Now, that's ridiculous. Then you have to take out a one-eighth page advertisement in a Cook County publication, and that rate would be extremely expensive. We're already covered under this by the Truth in Taxation Act. This is just simply overkill, only affects Cook County, and I really would urge a 'no' vote on this. I think a previous speaker already said that if you really want to do something, then let's talk about perhaps tax caps and, Mr. Speaker, should this get the requisite number of votes, I would request a verification."

Speaker McPike: "It won't. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 62 'ayes' and 49 'noes', and the Motion fails. Representative Morrow, did you wish to call your Motion on 1239?"

Morrow: "No. No."

Speaker McPike: "No. All right. Supplemental Calendar. Mr. Clerk, announce the Calendar."

Clerk McLennand: "Supplemental Calendar #1 is being distributed."

Speaker McPike: "Senate Bills, Second Reading. Senate Bill 87,

Representative Burke. Mr. Clerk, has this Bill been read a second time?"

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 87, offered by Representative

Burke, a Bill for an Act to recommend the School Code.

Second Reading of this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Has it been read a second time previously?"

Clerk McLennand: "No."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Any Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No Amendments. No Amendments have been filed."

85th Legislative Day October 13, 1993

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, did you say no Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No Amendments have been filed."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Hold the Bill on Second Reading.

Mr. Black, for what reason do you rise?"

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "I need the Chair to enlighten me on Senate Bill 87 as to where that's come from. I thought that Bill died in Committee last spring, died in House Executive Committee as I recall. Has it been resurrected or how's it suddenly appear on the Calendar?"

Speaker McPike: "Well, under...under our rules, all the Bills that were left in Committee and all the Bills that were left on the House floor revert to the Rules Committee. So there's no..."

Black: "I thought this Bill had a vote and was defeated in Committee."

Speaker McPike: "....well and then it stayed in Committee..."

Black: "...and so then it went to Rules and now it's been..."

Speaker McPike: "...yeah..."

Black: "...and now so it's been discharged."

Speaker McPike: "Right, right."

Black: "Right, okay."

Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 95, Representative Flinn. Monroe Flinn. Monroe. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 95, offered by Representative Flinn. A Bill for an Act in relation to taxation. No Committee Amendments, no Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Flinn, do you want to leave this on Second Reading? There are no Amendments. Leave it on Second?

Third Reading. All right, Senate Bill 433. Mr. Clerk,

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 433, offered by Representative

Turner has been read a second time previously. No

Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1 offered by

Representative Kaszak."

Speaker McPike: "Offered by whom?"

Clerk McLennand: "Representative Kaszak."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kaszak. Amendment #1."

Kaszak: "Mr. Speaker, this is...first, Amendment #1 is essentially House Bill 1162, which passed both the House and the Senate and was amendatorily vetoed by the Governor. This Amendment includes the material and the suggestions that were presented by the Governor. The Amendment and the Bill are endorsed by the Chicago Bar Association, Illinois State Bar Association and supported by the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association. It eliminates the retroactive impact of the Bill as originally drafted and the unintended effect of extending the statute of limitations on manufacturers liability. I know of no opposition to this Bill amended."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black on the 'do adopt' Motion."

Black: "Well, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair. Has Amendment #1 been printed and distributed?"

Speaker McPike: "No. Take this out of the record. It's not been printed. The Bill's been read a second time, and we'll leave it on Second Reading. Representative Olson, for what reason do you rise?"

Olson: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just went and picked up a copy of the vote on House Bill 317, and I noticed that for some reason I am recorded as absent. I would like the record to show that it was my intent and would have voted 'yes' on 317."

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Speaker McPike: "And the record will so reflect that."

Olson: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 450. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 450, offered by Representative

Hannig has been read a second time previously. Amendment

#1 was adopted in Committee."

Speaker McPike: "Any Motions?"

Clerk McLennand: "No Motions, no Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hannig, do you want this left on Second Reading? Yes. Senate Bill 485, Representative Flinn. Mr. Flinn. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 485, offered by Representative Flinn. A Bill for an Act concerning financial institution branches. Second Reading of the Bill. No Floor Amend...I mean, no Committee Amendments, no Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "All right, leave the Bill on Second Reading.

Senate Bill 684. Mr. Flinn. Representative Flinn."

Flinn: "Well, I have an Amendment to put on that Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, is there any Amendments filed to Representative Flinn's Bill? Senate Bill 485."

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Flinn."

Speaker McPike: "Who's the Sponsor of the Amendment?"

Clerk McLennand: "Representative Flinn."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Flinn. Amendment #1."

Flinn: "Well, Mr. Speaker, this Amendment very simply turns over to the banking commissioner the authority to call a certain amount of meetings for bank commissioners. Unless the local bank commissioners stay in business without being required to have one meeting a month, which really causes a bank to have hundreds of meetings in all their banks, and this leaves it up to the bank commissioners. I know of no

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

opposition, and I move for the adoption of this Amendment."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in support of this Amendment. This will allow those banks that have been acquired by larger banks or holding companies to maintain some kind of local director and local input. I think that's very important that this accommodation will give the director that opportunity. We would like to see that done and ask for your support."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black. Turn on Mr. Black, please."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Would the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Representative, it's my understanding that this Bill is totally permissive and that with the approval of the commissioner, said meetings can be held. Is that correct?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Flinn."

Flinn: "That's correct. Absolutely right."

Black: "Thank you very much."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor vote...say 'aye'; opposed 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it, and Amendment #1 is adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Mr. Clerk, has Senate Bill 485 been read previously on a Second Reading?"

Clerk McLennand: "No it has not."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Representative Flinn, the Bill is on Third Reading, and we'll get to it when we come back. Senate Bill 684, Representative Laurino. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill #684, offered by Representative

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Laurino. A Bill for an Act concerning prison industries.

Second Reading of this Bill. Amendment #1 was adopted in

Committee. No Floor Amendments, no Motions."

- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Laurino. Leave this on Second Reading.

  Senate Bill 766, Representative Laurino. Read the Bill,

  Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 766, offered by Representative
  Laurino. A Bill for an Act that amends the Court Reporters
  Act. Second Reading of the Bill. The Bill's been read a
  second time previously. No Committee Amendments. Floor
  Amendment #1 offered by Representative Phelps."

Speaker McPike: "Is this...printed?"

Clerk McLennand: "Yes, it is."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Phelps."

Phelps: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to withdraw

Amendment #1."

Speaker McPike: "Amendment #1 is withdrawn. Further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative Dart."

Speaker McPike: "All right, this is not printed, so take this out of the record. Senate Bill 1024. Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 1024, offered by Representative

Dart. A Bill for an Act amends the Home Rule Note Act.

Bill has been read a second time previously."

Speaker McPike: "Any Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No Committee Amendments, no Floor Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "All right, leave it on Second Reading. Senate
Bills, First Reading."

Clerk McLennand: "First Reading of Senate Bills."

Speaker McPike: "Read the Bill Mr. Clerk."

Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 868, offered by Representative

85th Legislative Day

- October 13, 1993
- McAfee. A Bill for an Act amends the Illinois Vehicle
  Code. First Reading of this Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 240, Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to recede from all House
  Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Lang. You're going to recede from which Amendment?"
- Lang: "All Amendments."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, how many Amendments are on this Bill?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Amendments #1 and 4."
- Speaker McPike: "All right. Mr. Lang, would you very briefly explain what those Amendments are?"
- Lang: "Those Amendments..."
- Speaker McPike: "This is final action, that's why the Chair is asking."
- Lang: "Those Amendments, Mr. Speaker, allowed for certain exemptions which passed on another Bill that the Governor already signed."
- Speaker McPike: "All right, thank you. Mr. Wennlund, on the Gentleman's Motion to recede."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May we have a little decorum here, because I could not hear the explanation of which Amendments 1 and 4 were, and what they did and what remains of the Bill."
- Speaker McPike: "Mr. Wennlund, I'm sorry."
- Wennlund: "Thank you. I'm just asking for a little decorum in the House. I could not hear Representative Lang's explanation of what Amendments 1 and 4 were. We don't have any files on them."
- Speaker McPike: "All right, Mr. Lang."
- Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Wennlund, Amendments #1 and 4

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

were certain exemptions that passed on a different Bill that the Governor already signed, so they're superfluous Amendments."

Wennlund: "What remains left of the Bill then, Representative Lang?"

Lang: "The original Bill. The original Bill."

Wennlund: "So the original Bill which prevents the burning of leaves in 17 counties?"

Lang: "That's correct."

Wennlund: "...and that's...that's a mandate on all local governments? It prevents them from a permitting the burning of leaves within their municipality?"

Lang: "Mr. Wennlund, we already passed this Bill twice in this House. This is a Motion to recede from House Amendments.

I've explained what those Amendments are."

Wennlund: "This is final action, is it not, Mr. Speaker? Is this final action? Mr. Speaker, could we have some order in this House please? Can't hear a thing that's going on."

Speaker McPike: "Yes, please. Give the Gentleman some order.

Yes, Mr. Wennlund, this is final action."

Wennlund: "Thank you. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, to the Bill. This is final action on this Bill, and I would ask that you pay attention to it, because what you're doing is, you're telling all counties in Illinois over 100,000 population, that they cannot permit the burning of leaves, regardless of what the feelings are of the people who reside in those counties, regardless of what decisions are made and what the feelings are of people who live in municipalities, residing within those 17 counties. Who is this, the General Assembly, telling the people of Will County that they can't burn leaves. That's a decision that ought to be made by the people living in Will County.

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

That's a decision that ought to be made by the municipalities that exist in Will County. The General Assembly shouldn't be mandating again as to what these counties and municipalities can and can not do, with respect to an issue like leaf burning. Leave it up to the Haven't you had these municipalities and municipalities. county governments telling you to quit mandating on what they can and cannot do. This is another one of those mandates and it ought to be defeated. Does this preempt home rule municipalities? I don't know the answer to that If it does, I would think that this requires 71 votes, Mr. Speaker, and an inquiry of the Chair. Does this require 71 votes because it preempts home rule? Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Does this require 71 votes because it preempts home rule?"

Speaker McPike: "No. It requires 60 votes. Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. An inquiry of the Chair."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Does this...the original Bill taking out these Amendments, does this not preempt home rule?"

Speaker McPike: "No."

Black: "It does not preempt home rule?"

Speaker McPike: "No, sir."

Black: "So, if I'm understanding the Chair, that in one of these counties that would be prohibited from burning leaves, if you have a home rule community in that county, you mean the county...that home rule community could say, 'Well, we have no means of disposing of these leaves, so we're going to allow leaf burning.' Would that be correct?"

Speaker McPike: "Yeah. Mr. Black, I misspoke. It does preempt home rule, but it preempts Section I of the Constitution

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

which requires only 60 votes."

Black: "All right. Further inquiry, Mr. Speaker. The board says

House Amendments #1, 1 and 4. Is that a misprint?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes, I asked the Clerk earlier and there are two

Amendments on the Bill, House Amendment #1 and House

Amendment #4."

Black: "All right, thank you very much. Mr. Speaker, may I speak to the Bill?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies Gentlemen of the House. Here we are in the fall of the year and the leaves are starting to turn and this Bill comes back to us at this particular, perhaps opportune I would simply ask those of you who intend to vote for this, if your county is affected by it, what plan exists to either compost or pick up the leaves? can't burn them, you're going to have to do something with them, and because of the landscape waste law that we passed a few years ago that has added thousands of dollars of cost to the disposal of lawn clippings and cost to municipal governments, what are you going to do with these leaves? Are you going to let them pile up? Well, some communities have rules that say you can't do that. So if you don't have a plan in effect to get rid of the leaves, then a 'no' vote might be advisable on this Bill that has been resurrected at the last minute. If you can't burn them, what are you going to do with them? And anybody that stands up and says this isn't a mandate on governments and all home owners had better rethink this. urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Tim Johnson."

Johnson, Tim: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. This Bill

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

is so ridiculous that I can't imagine that we're sitting chamber even considering this piece of here legislation. The practical results of this Bill make Illinois an absurd hodgepodge that doesn't make any sense governmentally, doesn't make any sense environmentally and doesn't make any sense period. For example, in our area, you could be under this Bill, you could burn openly in Piatt County or Ford County, you could burn in corporate limits of Bondville and Foosland, but obviously you can't in Champaign-Urbana, you can't already, you in Danville, you can't in Fisher, you can't in Mahomet, you can't in most unincorporated areas with certain exceptions. It's a bad idea anyway, but if you're going to do it, and you really mean what you say about environmental controls and environmental purity and air quality, none of which are even scientifically based anyway, at least do it on a consistent basis. This is a ridiculous Bill. It's a Bill people all over this state will completely fail to understand it, and when the small percentage who understand it, understand it because they are arrested for some violation they didn't know they committed, they're going to say that the General Assembly again did some ridiculous thing with no connection with reality, connection with the people who elected them and it's bad, bad, bad government. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have spoken on this issue a number of times.

I, as a local mayor at one time, think this is a local issue that ought to be decided by the local officials. In fact, Moline City Council on their debates on leaf burning has just gone the other way from tougher laws to expanding

# 85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

the leaf burning in the City of Moline. They've gone to a seven day situation on the burning of leaves. So, I would ask you also to consider this very carefully when you vote, because this is a local government issue, and that's where it ought to stay, and I would urge a 'no' vote on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Lang to close. Mr. Lang, your microphone is on. You can close."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Bill that has already passed the House and the Senate on two or three occasions. The only proper environmental vote here is a 'yes' This is a Bill that will keep toxins out of the air, it will protect the environment, it will take care of problem that asthmatic children are having. You all talked to the ladies that were working the Capitol, a couple of whom have had children die and doctors have said it's because of smoke in the air from leaf burning. The Representative that talked about Moline in his area, Moline They're doing more burning of expanded leaf burning. It's not fair to kids, it's not fair to leaves than ever. people who can't breathe, it's not fair to asthmatics. We've already passed this Bill twice. Twice. Let's recede from these Amendments and send the Bill right to the Governor. Please vote 'aye' and protect the environment."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall the House recede from House Amendments #1 and 4?' This is final action. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Mr. Brady to explain his vote."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen, I ask you to consider your vote here. This action is a mandate on local governments, and to put it in a proper perspective,

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

are we next Session going to pass legislation outlawing weiner roasts in your home districts? What's next? Let's leave it to the locals and let them decide."

Speaker McPike: "This Bill requires 60 votes. Have all voted?

Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The

Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 70

'ayes' and 43 'noes', and the House recedes from House

Amendments #1 and 4 to Senate Bill 240, and this Bill

having received the Constitutional Majority, is hereby

declared passed. Senate Bill 707, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Mr. Speaker, I would request that Representative Hoffman present the Conference Committee Report."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All this does, is it makes an effective date for a Bill that we previously passed regarding putting a referendum on the ballot in St. Clair County. I ask for an 'aye' vote."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Skinner on the Gentleman's Motion."

Skinner: '"That's all it does?"

Hoffman: "Yes, that's all it does."

Skinner: "What is the date?"

Hoffman: "What is what date?"

Skinner: "Whatever date you're talking about."

Hoffman: "Oh, the day the Governor signed it would be effective."

Skinner: "When is the date of the referendum?"

Hoffman: "November 2nd."

Skinner: "This year?"

Hoffman: "This year."

Skinner: "So we don't pass this, there's no referendum?"

Hoffman: "Well, that's...that's correct. We don't pass this, there's no referendum."

85th Legislative Day October 13, 1993

Skinner: "What's the referendum for?"

Hoffman: "The referendum is...is so the people of St. Clair

County can determine if they would like to extend a light
rail system into St. Clair County."

Skinner: "Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Bl...Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Inquiry of the Chair.

Is Floor Amendment #2 still on this Bill?"

Speaker McPike: "This is a Conference Committee. Mr. Hoffman, is there anything on the Bill except what you described?"

Hoffman: "No, all it has to do with is the effective date."

Speaker McPike: "All right, there's nothing on this Bill except an effective date to a Bill that the Governor signed."

Black: "Does the underlying Bill still have anything to do with the forest preserve levy?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hoffman."

Hoffman: "Yes it does and I apologize Mr. Black. It validates
the forest preserve levy."

Black: "All right, so it's..."

Hoffman: "For Cook County and downstate."

Black: "...validating the forest preserve levy, right?

Basically...right."

Hoffman: "Right. I apologize, I didn't know that was on there."

Black: "That's all right. Well we've seen this every year and I think everybody knows how they want to vote on this. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Will the Gentleman yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Daniels: "Could you define for purpose of the record what you mean by levy by general category?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Hoffman."

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Hoffman: "It's my understanding it's an attempt to allow these forest preserves not to have to come back to the General Assembly every year. So, now their appropriation is validated."

Daniels: "That's what you say the Bill does, but for court purposes it's anticipated there may be a lawsuit filed on this. We need a definition from you as to what you mean by levy by general category because those are the substitute words that you are putting in there instead of levy validation."

Daniels: "No. How many signatures were on this Conference

Committee Report?"

Hoffman: "Six."

Daniels: "Okay."

Hoffman: "Representative, I'll be honest with you. I'll be honest with you. Prior to this, my concern is with the St. Clair County insuring that there's an effective date. As far as the forest preserve, I'm not exactly sure who's carrying that portion of it. It's my understanding that Senate Republicans wanted that on this Bill."

Daniels: "Representative, I'm not trying to cause you any problems, it's just that this is apparently an effort to avoid the validation Bill, the levy validation Bill which the Senate Republicans refuse to consider. As a compromise, the proponents were willing to settle for the ability to levy by general category. We don't know what is meant in legal terms, levy by general category. For purpose of the record, we're trying to clear that up before this is considered. Now maybe, Mr. Speaker, we could call this Bill in two weeks when we come back, and in the

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

interim period, we could get that definition so that he could read it into the record, so if it does get into court, you're not going to have that problem."

Hoffman: "Mr. Speaker, if that is Mr. Daniel's wish, I have no problem if it is okay with the Speaker to come back to it."

Speaker McPike: "Well, why don't you try to get the legal definition so it can be read into the record and we can get that done in the next hour or so, we can come back to this Bill."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Total Veto Motions. House Bill 293.

Mr. Flinn. Representative Flinn. Is the Gentleman back
there? Yes, he's there. Mr. Flinn, 293 on a Total Veto
Motion. I can't see Mr. Flinn, there's too many people in
the aisle."

Flinn: "Take it out of the record."

Speaker McPike: "Out of the record, thank you. Mr. Hoffman on House Bill 1256."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I have a Motion to override the Governor's Veto of House Bill 1256. Basically, it is my understanding, the Governor vetoed a portion of the Bill out relating to the...Senator Klemm's Amendment which says that the circuit court of a county, if an individual is convicted of a sexual abuse or sexual assault crime, and works for a school district or day care center, the court would have to notify that school district or day care center. I would ask that we override the Governor's Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have an inquiry of the Chair on this particular Motion. Was not House Bill 1256 amendatorily vetoed by the Governor?"

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Speaker McPike: "Yes, and he's moving to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Black: "Has this been ruled not in compliance?"

Speaker McPike: "It really wouldn't make any difference if it was ruled in compliance or not compliance. The Gentleman is making a Motion to override the Governor's Veto. If it was in compliance, he could still move to override. He doesn't have to move to accept. He's moving to override."

Black: "In the past, we have either moved to accept the Governor's language or to the Governor's language notwithstanding, override the Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "It seems to me that we've changed the rules here. Trying to get around the Amendatory Veto process."

Speaker McPike: "To be honest with you, I don't follow...I don't follow you. The Gentleman has moved..."

Black: "I'm not sure I follow myself either, I think there's something going on here I don't quite understand. In the past, we've had calendars that have said Amendatory Veto, and now all of a sudden we see everything coming back to us either as an Amendment to another Bill or a Total Veto Override. This Bill was not vetoed."

Speaker McPike: "Well, Mr. Black, we have had these Veto Motions every year since I've been here, and the Motion is, 'Shall House Bill or Senate Bill pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change?' So, it's an...that's the Motion."

Black: "Okay. Well, I see in the past, since there was some rule change, we've had a calendar that some Amendatory Vetoes were not in compliance and others were in compliance."

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "I haven't see that this year. Were they all ruled not in

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

compliance?"

Speaker McPike: "No, but we're not on that yet. We're on Total

Veto Motions. I've been going straight down this calendar.

We're on Total Veto Motions."

Black: "Okay, so in other words, the Gentleman is asking that we override or not pay any attention to the Governor's Amendatory Veto language. He just wants to reinstate his Bill as it passed. So that's what we're doing, right?"

Speaker McPike: "That's correct. It's called an override."

Black: "I...I see."

Speaker McPike: "He wants to override the Governor."

Black: "That requires 71 votes."

Speaker McPike: "That's correct."

Black: "I see. Well, thank you. I appreciate you clearing that up for me."

Speaker McPike: "Okay. Representative Skinner on the Gentleman's Motion."

Skinner: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this override of the Governor's Veto. I would point to you specifically to Page the Bill, part of which says what this is all about. When someone has been convicted of a crime which would keep a teacher...would force a teacher to lose his license to teach, his certification, the court shall determine whether the defendant is employed by a facility or center, I presume this is a day care center as defined under the Child Care Act, a public or private elementary or secondary school or otherwise works with children under 18 years of age on a daily basis. When a defendant is so employed, the court shall order the clerk of the court to send a copy of judgement of conviction order of supervision or the probation to the defendant's employer by certified mail. Now why is this language in this Bill? It's in here

# 85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

because the superintendent of the Wonder Lakes School District was soliciting for prostitution in Chicago, little girls if I remember correctly, and the Cook County judge put the person on supervision. Well, the local school district did not find out about this until it ended up on the front...well on the news broadcast from Chicago when the superintendent went to school...went to Chicago to solicit another little girl. It seems to us in McHenry County, that the school boards ought to know if their teachers or superintendents are likely or at least at of soliciting their own kids for deviate sexual acts. The Governor vetoed this Bill, because he thinks it is a local My State Senator if I could quote him, he came mandate. out with a pretty good summation of the type of mandate we're talking about. He says, 'I'll write the check for \$10 for the certified letters that will have to be Obviously it's a little more than that, but here's a question of shall we protect our kids or shall not protect our kids? And in this case, I'm certainly going to vote for the kids, and that means voting to override this Veto."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1256 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change?' This Motion requires 71 votes. All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Hoffman. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 'ayes' and no 'nays'. This Motion, having received the required three-fifths Majority, the Motion to and House Bill 1256 is declared passed. notwithstanding the Governor's recommendations for change. House Bill 1687, Representative Schakowsky. You want to

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

call this? Representative Schakowsky."

Schakowsky: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. This was... House Bill 1687 is an important consumer protection measure that was introduced as a result of over 2,000, actually nearly 2,300 complaints to the Attorney General's Office about sweepstakes and prizes fraudulent kinds of advertising that went on through about these prizes. This was a Bill that passed the House almost unanimously, one negative vote, passed the Senate unanimously, was supported by the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, and it wasn't till after, well after it reached the Governor's desk, that one advertising agency hired a prestigious law firm to go to the Governor and as a result, the Bill has been gutted. It is our view and view of many of your constituents who contacted Attorney General's Office that the protections in this Bill are needed and the Amendatory Veto creates such broad exemptions that it would be impossible to stop any of the targeted scams. Therefore, in order to respond to what is clearly a problem in Illinois, and in order to uphold the solution that this General Assembly (both Houses felt was right) and that even the Illinois Retail Merchants Association believed in, I would urge that we do what we originally said and override the Amendatory Veto."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Now, let's not make any mistake here. What we're caught up in, is an ongoing battle as to whether or not the Governor has the authority to make Amendatory Vetoes to legislation. The underlying Bill is not the issue here. We're caught up in a fight that some people on your side of the aisle say that the Governor can't make

### 85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Amendatory Vetoes, particularly if he changes the Bill in any way. Well, now this is a case where the Governor's Amendatory Veto made this Bill more palatable to the people I stand in strong opposition to this Override Motion and let me just tell you who joins with me. The following agencies request that you vote 'no' override, but had you had an opportunity they would have requested you vote to accept the Governor's Amendatory The Illinois Retail Merchants Association says vote 'no' to override, the Illinois Soft Drink Association, Illinois Press Association. This would outlaw games of chance that you see in the Tribune and the Sun Times for crying out loud. The Promotion Markers Association of America that includes McDonalds and Kraft urge you to vote on a Motion to override. Had you been able to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto, Illinois businesses would still be able to advertise and use standard promotional devices to promote current and new consumer products. Since you aren't going to get a chance to vote on the amendatory language, it's an either/or situation, think the Merchants Association and the others, the Press Association tell you very clearly that without the amendatory language, the Bill goes too far and would prohibit even the most meaningless to perhaps you important advertising schemes to your local merchants, newspapers or retailers. And it's for that reason, and that reason only, I stand in opposition and urge you to vote 'no' on the Motion to override."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1687 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's Specific Recommendations for change?' Representative Daniels on that Motion."

Daniels: "Just briefly, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. The

# 85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Governor's Amendatory Veto was some four pages in length and contained many very technical provisions that improved this Bill all in the lines of what Representative Black articulated. It is very, very important that this Override Motion be defeated, because the Bill in its current form without the Motion being defeated would violate many, many provisions of our current law, also make our current...the law as changed by this Bill to be totally unworkable, and so I join with Representative Black and others in suggesting strongly that you vote to sustain the Governor's action on this Bill."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Schakowsky to close."

- Schakowsky: "Thank you, Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. This is not a little battle over who has the power to do what. This Bill was substantially gutted. This Bill was changed and the Bill that we originally passed was passed with the help and support and active effort of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, who now, after the fact realize that they can really get rid of this Bill, that they didn't want to have to deal with it in the first place. We are willing to sit down if there are technical changes and deal with them, but this is a gutted Bill, and I urge an override."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1687 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

  Representative Wennlund to explain his vote."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the event that this gets the requisite number of votes, I request a verification."
- Speaker McPike: "All right. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 45 'ayes' and 64 'noes',

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

and the Motion fails. House Bill 1912, Representative Moseley."

Moseley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise today to request an override of the Governor's Amendatory Veto on House Bill This Bill, which is somewhat confusing to those of understand don't you who what a Certificate Participation is, would require that COPS, or Certificates Participation, would be bid competitively. there is no provision to bid these things These are basically similar to bonds which competitively. agencies can go into at any point without legislative They are frequently in the area of professional and creative contracts, which is also a very expensive endeavor that the state has gotten into in recent years. When I was first approached by Comptroller Netsch with this particular legislation, we had a much more restrictive language in it, and over the legislative process we worked consistently with the Department of Central Management Services to get language that they could agree with. This language, which was originally in the Bill, was what was agreed to by the Department of Central Management Services, all the way through those torturous months of June and July that we were here. So, I found it highly irregular that this measure was amendatorily vetoed after we had worked so long and hard on it. You are going to hear that by allowing a competitive selection process instead of a competitive bid, that this will allow for cost savings within state I would like to point out that what it actually allows, is for the state to continue to avoid the requirements of a competitive bid and allow them to go into some negotiations which have raised eyebrows in the past. In the Governor's Message, he points to competitive

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

negotiation procedures should also apply to selection of law firms which traditionally are not competitively bid. It is my contention that if we did bid competitively on law firms, we could save the state millions of dollars every year. So, I would like to ask for your favorable vote on this override, and I'll answer any questions. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Ryder to speak against the Lady's Motion."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Let me explain to you that the Certificates of Participation are a way of saving the state money. In fact, Certificates of Participation have suggested by Legislators, the Administration, and others as a way of the state being able to reduce the amount of expenditures we have in many cases of the ways of rent, In order for it to work, however, there has to be leases. a flexibility of negotiation in order for us to achieve the savings. What the Bill does, is remove that flexibility so that we end up paying more. Now I'm not in favor spending money. I would suggest that you're probably not either, to spend money that costs us more to do something that we've set up to save us money. So, you'll hear some language suggesting that, 'Well, we negotiated this and we put these things in', but let's look at the bottom line here. It is the Legislature that appropriates. We the final say on any Certificates of Participation that are entered into. We provide the money, so that if we believe that the flexibility granted to those who negotiate didn't produce the best product, we don't provide the money. restrict to hamstring to remove the flexibility, defeats the purpose of Certificates of Participation. I compliment the Sponsor on attempting to do something that will help us, but the intent of this Motion is to hinder us. to cost us more money when we're trying to save money.

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

That part doesn't make sense to me. For that reason, we oppose the intention to override the Veto. I apologize to the Sponsor of the Bill if she felt that negotiations were something that were somehow cast in stone. It is not that way. I think that perhaps she may understand that. She may be a freshman, but she's not a novice. As a result, I would strongly urge that you give the flexibility to allow the State of Illinois to save some money for a change so that we can save money for taxpayers. For that reason, I stand in opposition to the Motion."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 1912 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of House. First of all, the Amendatory Veto...we talked about be competitive, and we do respect the previous speakers. Let's talk about flexibility. Let's talk about the pharmaceutical contracts that went out of state. talk about competitively bid contracts that go to patronage people to go to fundraisers. Let's talk about the right thing to do. Let's talk about making a competitive Let's talk about the merits. We talk about flexibility, that means the flexibility to give it to people who donate to your campaigns. We're trying to save the state money. Let's be a little more stringent Ladies and Gentlemen. Let's do it on the merits. Let's save the state money. Let's make it competitively bid for a change. Let's do the right thing. Let's make it on the merits. Let's actually save the state money. And to the 'no' votes up there, look at the papers the last few weeks, Ladies Gentlemen. Look at the papers on what's been going on and

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

what the public's reaction is. If you're trying to save the state money, you don't vote against this. You don't vote against this, you want to make it competitively bid. You don't want the inside jobs being pulled. You don't want these things being done to give contracts to people who make...who don't make the laws bend. Look at Mettawa, look at all these things that are going on. And your 'no' vote is the wrong vote, and I'd just be aware, and I think people ought to vote 'green' because this is the right thing to do to save the state money."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Wennlund."

Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In the event that this gets

the requisite number of votes, I request a

verification...but..."

Speaker McPike: "All right."

Wennlund: "...but to the issue itself. How many people in this
House even know what a Certificate of Participation is?

Very few, if any. So, you really don't know what you're
voting on here, and if you don't know that a Certificate of
Participation is not really subject to or doesn't lend
itself to a strict competitive bidding process. That's why
the flexibility is needed, and that's why this Motion
should be defeated."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. In all due respect to my colleague, the floor leader on the other side of the aisle, his remarks, which went on practically to be a filibuster, you are not addressed...were not addressing this Bill in any way, shape, or form. It's addressing an issue that he has taken to the press, which is his right, in the last couple of weeks, but that issue now is moot, that item was cancelled. It has nothing to do with this

#### 85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Bill, and he's gotten about ten of you to vote 'green' on a Bill you don't even know what it does. You'd better vote on the Bill, and not the issue that your floor leader tried to hoist up the flagpole and see how many of you would salute. All this Bill does, and once again, if you had the opportunity to vote on the Amendatory language, makes a Certificate of Participation conform to the Purchasing Act. That's all the Governor's Amendatory Veto language did. But oh no, we're going to override something because of a...COP..."

- Speaker McPike: "Representative Davis. One minute to explain your vote."
- Davis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My concern is...if we go out of state with so called lowest bids, we're often unemploying people in our own state and, you know, if someone can...you know...maybe give some clarity on that, it would be most appreciated. But my understanding from several incidents from the University of Illinois with that competitive bidding process, the work was given to people who live in Indiana or Wisconsin, causing unemployment in the State of Illinois."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Representative Moseley to explain her vote. One minute."
- Moseley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to make a comment about the...there may be some confusion with the last speaker. The competitive bidding process on Certificates of Participation would usually require leases, would be in terms of leases and things that would be within the State of Illinois anyway, so this would not be sending jobs out of the state...and we should be addressing that in other areas anyway when we require that the state have a certain

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

percentage of things done within the state. So, I just wanted to clarify that, but I also wanted to review some statements that were made earlier. When we talk about saving the state money and that this would give them no ceiling...or this would give them no flexibility, the state agencies retain the ability to say we will not go over a certain amount. They still have the flexibility to use a ceiling on their purchases which would allow them the ability to save the state money. The requirements..."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 71 'ayes' and 46 'noes', and Mr. Wennlund has asked for a verification. Mr. Clerk, poll the affirmative."

Clerk McLennand: "Those voting in the affirmative. Representatives Balanoff. Blagojevich. Brunsvold. Buqielski. Burke. Capparelli. Curran. Currie. Dart. Davis. Deering. DeJaegher. Dunn. Edley. Erwin. Flowers. Frias. Gash. Giglio. Giles. Giolitto. Giorgi. Granberg. Hannig. Hartke. Hawkins. Hicks. Jones, Shirley. Hoffman. Homer. Jones, Lou. Kaszak. Kotlarz. Lang. Laurino. Lawfer. Levin. Lopez. McAfee. McGuire. McPike. Martinez. Mautino. Moffitt. Moore, Eugene. Morrow. Moseley. Murphy, H. Novak. Ostenburg. Phelan. Phelps. Prussing. Pugh. Ronen. Rotello. Saltsman. Santiago. Schakowsky. Schoenberg. Sheehy. Steczo. Stephens. Stroger. Turner. von B-Wessels. Weaver. Woolard. Younge. And Mr. Speaker."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Mr. Wennlund. Representative
Younge, Wyvetter Younge is right here. She would like to
be verified. Is that all right? Thank you. All right,
Mr. Wennlund, proceed."

Wennlund: "Representative Novak?"

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Novak? Mr. Novak? Mr. Novak is not here, remove him from the Roll Call. Mr. DeJaegher would like to get verified and Representative Rotello would like to get verified. All right, proceed. Novak has been removed from the Roll."

Wennlund: "Rotello and who, Mr. Speaker?"

Speaker McPike: "Rotello and DeJaegher."

Wennlund: "Thank you. Representative Martinez?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Martinez? Where is he? He's at the doctor's office. Oh, he's at the nurse's station. You want us to go get him? He's at the nurse's station. Mr. Wennlund, do you want to persist in that one? He's at the nurse's station."

Wennlund: "Okay."

Speaker McPike: "All right. He's not going to persist in that one at the moment. All right, proceed. Edley would like to get verified, he's in the center aisle. Is that all right? Okay."

Wennlund: "Representative Hannig?"

Speaker McPike: "Hannig is here."

Wennlund: "Representative Gillis?"

Speaker McPike: "Who?"

Wennlund: "Gillis."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Gillis. Mr. Gillis. No, he didn't ask for Giles, he asked for Gillis."

Wennlund: "Giles, I don't know how you pronounce it."

Speaker McPike: "We don't have a Gillis."

Wennlund: "Giles?"

Speaker McPike: "Oh. Representative Giles? Mr. Giles, is not here, remove him from the roll call."

Wennlund: "Representative Lopez?"

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Lopez is not here. Remove him from the Roll

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Call."

Wennlund: "Representative Flowers?"

Speaker McPike: "Oh, I'm sorry, Edgar Lopez is sitting over there with Saviano. Put him back on the roll call. All right, who is next? I really...I put Lopez back on the roll call.

Who was next?"

Wennlund: "Representative Flowers?"

Speaker McPike: "Mary Flowers is not here. Remove her...no here she is, over here. She's here. Thank you."

Wennlund: "Representative Hawkins?"

Speaker McPike: "Hawkins is here."

Wennlund: "Representative Morrow?"

Speaker McPike: "Representative Morrow? Would somebody go back and get those guys. Mr. Morrow is not on the floor. Remove him, please."

Wennlund: "Representative Saltsman?"

Speaker McPike: "Saltsman? He's here."

Wennlund: "Representative Weaver?"

Speaker McPike: "Weaver? Representative Weaver is here."

Wennlund: "Nothing further."

Speaker McPike: "All right. Any changes? On this Motion, there are 68 'ayes' and 46 'noes', and the Motion fails.

Amendatory Veto Motions Gubernatorial Compliance, appears
House Bill 659. Representative Steczo. Mr. Steczo."

Steczo: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. House
Bill 659 created the...creates the Oil Spiller Responders
Liability Act. In the course of reviewing the Bill, the
Governor amendatorily vetoed the language, adding language
which he says would make the Bill consistent with the Good
Samaritan Statutes of this state and also remove certain
inconsistencies. In that regard, I feel that the
Amendatory Veto makes good sense, and I would move at this

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

time, Mr. Speaker, to accept the Governor's recommendations for change."

- "The question is, 'Shall the House accept Speaker McPike: specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 659?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 109 'ayes'...Representative Deuchler votes 'ave'. Motion, there are 110 'ayes', Cory Pugh votes Wyvetter Younge votes 'aye', Representative Murphy votes 'aye', Representative Moseley votes 'aye'. Anything else? Representative Wirsing votes 'aye'. On this Motion, there are 115 'ayes' and 1 'no'. This Motion has received Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is required adopted, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 659. House Bill 1451, Representative Dart. Mr. Dart."
- Dart: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move to accept the Governor's

  Amendatory Veto on this measure. This was a measure
  sponsored by the State's Attorney's Association and the
  Governor's Amendatory Veto made some changes and minor
  changes in the language to make it read a little clearer."
- Speaker McPike: "The question is 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1451?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 'ayes' and no 'nays'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority, so the Motion is adopted the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 1451. House Bill 2375, Representative Ryder."

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am moving to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto. The Governor changed a single word in this Bill and on page 7, line 23, he replaced 'or' with the word 'and' meaning that not only must the person to be guilty find it necessary to own the equipment but also to use the equipment in the illegal fashion. For that reason, I would move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto."

Speaker McPike: "And we would like to represent, we would like to welcome Representative Buzz Yourell back to the House floor. On Mr. Ryder's Motion, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 2375?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 116 'aye' and 1 'no'. This Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority. The Motion is adopted, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 2375. House Bill 467, Representative Prussing."

Prussing: "Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, House Bill 467 is to register geologists in the State of Illinois. This was requested by the geologists. They are concerned about the quality of work that is being done, and it would be a gain in revenue to the State of Illinois. It was estimated to bring in \$400,000 more than it would cost; and Senator Weaver sponsored it in the Senate, and it passed by a very wide majority, and I would urge you to vote to override the Governor's Veto. Thank you."

Speaker McPike: "And on the Lady's Motion, Mr. Black."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. To the Bill or to the Motion. The Sponsor is obviously sincere in what she wants to do with

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

this measure. I think the Department of Professional Regulation is equally as sincere in saying that we cannot continue to allow people to be licensed and registered and dealt with in the Department of Professional Regulation unless we are willing to give them the money to carry out the task. I would submit to many of you on this floor, and I don't think this is a partisan issue, we often have to call the Department of Professional Regulation because of the time it takes to get licenses issued. I know I've two or three nurses, one or two doctors who have been hung up because this department is understaffed, underfunded and cannot simply, simply cannot take on more of the duties that this Body asks them to do if we don't intend to give them the funding. So, I don't stand in opposition Sponsor's Bill as such. I just simply remind you that we've not given the department the money to handle these additional requests, and until we do so, we're simply kidding ourselves, and we're making our constituents more and more angry by the delays that it takes to get their licenses not only issued but renewed in a timely And for that reason and that reason alone, I intend to vote 'no'."

Speaker McPike: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 467 pass, the

Veto of the Governor notwithstanding?' All in favor vote
'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Representative Skinner to
explain his vote."

Skinner: "Well, I suspect there are more people voting for this override than there are geologists in the State of Illinois. It would seem to me that the geologists ought to be able to stand on their credentials and not have to come to the State for a stamp of approval. If we are going to license geologists, I would reiterate my plea from earlier

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

this spring and that is that we also license housewives and cat walkers and dog walkers and every other profession that anyone can think of. I mean we've almost done it already."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Prussing."

Prussing: "I think that the Bill actually does deal with quality of work that is being done. We have passed Bills to allow nongeologists to do geological work and I think that we are creating a serious problem in the quality and that affects public safety. The geologists are willing to money to have this registration program. states have done this. We have been registering people since the beginning of the state when we used to register ferryboat operators before we had bridges across our rivers. It is a source of revenue and to Representative Black, the initial funding was dealt with by Senator Weaver in the Senate. So, I think that this will bring in \$400,000 more than it costs, and I don't think the State can afford to pass up a revenue source like this, I urge you to vote 'yes'."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Brady, one minute to explain your vote."

Brady: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was just curious of the Sponsor, if this Legislation passed, if we will be able to pull the licensing of geologists if they fail to pay their child support."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Mr.

Deering, how do you want to vote? Mr. Deering, how did you wish to vote? Mr. Deering, you are voting 'no' at the present time. Did you want to change it to 'aye'? All right, Mr. Deering votes 'aye'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. Edley votes

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Edley votes 'aye'. On this Motion. there are...Wennlund votes 'no'. Representative Wennlund votes 'no'. All right, Mr. Clerk, have you taken the record? Are there any other changes? On this Motion, there are 70 'ayes' and 48 'noes', and the Motion Representative Kubik, House Bill 1377. I'm Supplemental Calendar Announcement."

Clerk Rossi: "Supplemental Calendar #2 is being distributed."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Kubik on 1377."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. I would move to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 1377. And essentially what the Amendatory Veto does is to remove the objections that were placed against the Bill by the Chicago Sun Times. They had objected saying that this would prohibit them from operating a game that they wish to operate. So, we have removed the provision which would, or the Governor removed the provision which would affect that Newspaper. So, I would be happy to respond to any questions and would appreciate your support of House Bill, of my Motion on House Bill 1377."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black, on the Motion."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a request of the Chair. In keeping with the truth and 'clerksation' Bill, this isn't on Supplemental Calendar #1. Shouldn't the Clerk record that this was on Supplemental Calendar #2? See, I couldn't find this Bill on Supplemental #1."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Clerk, would you try to fix your computers?"

Black: "So, it is on 2, right?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes."

Black: "Okay, it wasn't on First? It was on Second? All right.
Will there be a Third?"

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Speaker McPike: "No. The question is, 'Shall the House accept the specific recommendations for change with respect to House Bill 1377?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote McAfee 'aye'. Have all voted? Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. this Motion, there are 118 'ayes', no 'nays'. Motion has received the required Constitutional Majority. The Motion is adopted, and the House accepts the Governor's specific recommendations for change on House Bill 1377. Supplemental Calendar #2 under Total Veto Motions, Representative Giglio. House Bill 392."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. What House Bill 392 did was to say that before entering school, the children have to be immunized and there was also a provision in there about those colleges that don't have permanent residence students didn't apply. in his Message said that he The Governor. endorses immunization, but he says it would put a unfair burden on the children, and he didn't want to punish the because of the parents. Well, you know, if we're going to teach any of these parents to take care of their children, and we're going to allow the teachers to teach and not worry about playing doctor or policemen or psychologists or anything else, parents are going to have to learn that before they bring their children to school to start in September, that there is certain requirements that must fulfilled. And this is one of them, and that is why this Bill passed both Houses and the Governor saw fit to veto it. I would ask for the override."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Ryder."

Ryder: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker McPike: "Yes. Yes."

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

- Ryder: "Thank you. Representative, we show on our voting that the original Bill left the House with a large majority and came back with a Senate Amendment that only passed this House with 60 votes. Can you tell me what that Senate Amendment was, please?"
- Giglio: "The Senate Amendment was what I mentioned before, Representative, that those students that go to college, who are colleges that do not have permanent residency do not live in dorms such as Governor State, Chicago State, Northeastern, and other colleges that they were excused because they were in transit and a lot of them had their shots when they were children and to go back and research their record would have been too much and it would put a damper on the enrollment at the colleges, so that Amendment was tacked on and that was when it came back."
- Ryder: "Does the Bill, as passed the House, does it still exempt community colleges?"
- Giglio: "Well, it had nothing...community colleges weren't in there. This was..."
- Ryder: "So, it didn't mention community colleges at all?"
- Giglio: "No. No. This was for elementary and secondary."
- Giglio: "Grade school and high school. All right, maybe I am wrong. Just grade school."
- Ryder: "I would suggest that you might double check your language. Our analysis indicates that specifically that was the problem. This Bill only passed the House with 60 votes."
- Giglio: "Well, that was because of the Amendment, Representative."
- Ryder: "The Representative...the Amendment that is causing the

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

problem right now."

Giglio: "No, I don't think the Amendment caused the problem. I think the Governor's Veto Message, you know, speaks for itself."

Ryder: "To the Motion, Mr. Speaker, if I may. Ladies Gentlemen of the House, I would ask you to pay particular attention to the Motion that is before you simply for reason that many of you voted against this Bill in the first place. The Amendatory Veto cleared the reason you voted against it. So, understand what's going on. voted for the Bill, 111 of us voted for the Bill to begin with. It went to the Senate and the Senate put on a Amendment. The Sponsor said 'I agree with that bad Amendment' and only 60 people then voted 'yes' to concur with the bad Amendment. So, it leaves us and goes Governor. The Governor said, 'It is a bad Amendment; I delete that Amendment', and now the same Sponsor comes back and says 'Well, that's not a problem, I want 71 people to override the Amendment'. Be very careful here because you've already voted against the Amendment that being asked to support right now, and it is a controversial Amendment, I might add. So, as a consequence, please be aware that in all likelihood, many of us voted against this Amendment that the Sponsor now wants us to support. strongly urge you not to support his Motion to override. strongly urge you to be consistent with your previous votes and to not support the Motion to override."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall House Bill 392 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change?' All those in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Balthis."

Balthis: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like just to read from the

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

House Republican Staff Analysis. It simply says that the Governor removes the provisions that school children must present proof prior to the commencement of current school year that they have already had their requirements, immunizations. The Governor did not veto the Governor's State Amendment to this Bill. He vetoed the requirement for children to have immunization proof prior to school. So, if the Governor thought that portion was all right, what was wrong with this Body believing it's all right. I rise in support of the Gentleman's Motion."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Black. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? This takes 71 votes. Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion there are 67 'ayes' and 46 'noes', and the Motion fails. Representative Steczo, 2307. House Bill 2307. Steczo."

"Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House. Steczo: Bill 2307 was a Bill that passed this General Assembly last year which amends the Liquor Control Act and makes a number of changes with the intent of strengthening what we call here in Illinois the...thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill has the intent of attempting to try to strengthen in Illinois here call the three tier system of suppliers, distributors, and retailers for the purposes of supplying, distributing, and selling alcoholic beverages in the state. This Bill contained a number of important provisions. The Governor sought to veto one major provision out of The Bill actually, if one would think about it. after looking at the provisions that the Governor took out, there's no question, we feel, that the Governor was in wrong in doing that. What the Governor took out of House Bill 2307 are two provisions. One that says that all

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

distributors shall devote reasonable efforts and resources to the sale and distribution of liquors. Can there be anything wrong with suggesting that those distributors who have contracts to provide those products in Illinois devote reasonable efforts and resources to do that? Secondly, deleted language that says no distributor can refuse to sell alcohol to a retailer. The most basic premise of whole marketing system and philosophy in the State of Illinois and in the United States is if you have a distribution system, the retailers that sell those products should have access to those products. What can happen now and what this seeks to change is the situation where the little mom and pop grocery store or liquor store can't get a hold of a product because servicing the large accounts are too important. That's ridiculous and really violates every premise that we have. Those are the two areas the Governor vetoed out of this legislation and quite frankly, he was wrong in doing so. So, we would like put that language back in, and I would encourage Members of this House who are reasonable and sensible to say 'yes' to putting that language back in the statute, and I would move at this point and time, Mr. Speaker, to override the Governor's Amendatory Veto of House Bill 2307."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Black in opposition to the Motion."

Black: "Yes, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I reluctantly rise to oppose the Representative's Motion to totally override the Governor's Veto. The art of negotiation is compromise, and no one got everything they wanted in this a result of the Governor's amendatory language. and I'm somewhat amazed at However, the amount of correspondence that I, and I'm sure all of you have received on this Bill, but those people who deal with this

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

subject everyday are telling us to accept the Governor's Amendatory Veto. I quote from a letter from the Associated Beer Distributors of Illinois. 'We are subsequently urging the Members of the General Assembly to Amendatory Veto because of the importance of the Come to Rest Language in House Bill 2307 that will not be affected the Amendatory Veto. This language assures that all alcoholic liquor shipped into Illinois are verifiable taxed under the provision of the Liquor Galonage Tax.' think you all received the same letters I did from practically every distiller, and I must have received forty from the Paddington Corporation in Itasca, Illinois. A11 of these people who make their living in this field are urging us to accept the Governor's Amendatory language, and since I would simply say that I think they probably know more about this problem than I do, I'm willing to go along with them on that. And to do so, we have to vote on this Motion to totally override the Governor's Veto. So, hopefully we can accept the amendatory language and the Bill seems to then be acceptable to all parties. I urge a 'no' vote."

Speaker McPike: "The question is 'Shall House Bill 2307 pass, notwithstanding the Governor's specific recommendations for change?' All in favor, vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'.

Representative Leitch."

Leitch: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. With all respect to the previous Speaker, I'm informed that, by the beer distributors, that since the Amendatory Veto language will not be called and be before us, that they very much want to override this Bill, and I would urge Members to consider that and vote to override."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Mautino."

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

- Mautino: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Members of the House. I rise in very strong support of the measure to override. The issue that we're talking about in here is similar to cherry picking. We're just saying that you should go out and you have to service each of those accounts which hold the liquor license. The Bill itself, the underlying Bill, has been worked very thoroughly, and I do believe that we should see some 'green' votes up here. These are necessary changes important to the distributorships throughout the State of Illinois, and I urge you to reconsider your votes. I'd like to see some 'green' lights."
- Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 20...there are 30 'ayes' and 74 'noes', and the Motion fails. We're going to return to Representative Hoffman's Bill. Mr. Hoffman, what was that Bill number? Mr. Hoffman, what was the Bill number?"
- Hoffman: "(Senate Bill) 707. (Senate Bill) 707. Senate Bill 707."
- Speaker McPike: "Senate Bill 707, Mr. Hoffman."
- Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. We had a brief discussion regarding this Bill. Really all it does is, it puts an effective date on a Bill we passed in another Session and also makes a reference to validation and assuring that we don't have to continue to do that year in and year out."
- Speaker McPike: "Alright and Mr...Representative Daniels had a question on this Bill. No? All right. No one is standing in opposition to the Bill then...Mr. Wennlund."
- Wennlund: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, just so you know what you're doing here. What you are doing from now until eternity is saying that it is

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

presumed that every budget, every levy of a forest preserve district in Illinois is presumed to be valid and it cuts off the rights of all property owners to contest the validity of a levy of a forest preserve district. think about the property taxpayers and think about what kind of vote this can be for you back home, because you're saying that from now on, forever, regardless of whether it's valid or invalid, every levy of а county forest preserve district is presumed valid and the property taxpayers have no rights whatsoever to challenge it. That's what you're doing if you vote for this Conference Committee Report."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall...shall the House adopt the First Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 707?' All in favor vote 'aye'; opposed vote 'no'. Mr. Hoffman, to explain his vote."

Hoffman: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that everybody needs to understand what they're doing here. This does two First of all, all it does is give an effective date, it gives an effective date so that the people in Clair County...people in St. Clair County, it's something we vote on can have something on the ballot to determine what they want to do November 2nd of this year. The second thing it does, is all it says is that we don't have to, year in and year out, be a rubber stamp for levies. What we're saying is that you can, on a local level, they can make their own decision and people are elected locally. respectfully disagree with the previous speaker. not do what he's saying. The intent is that tax ordinance will not be invalid simply because it is not itemized in specific detail. That's all this does, the specific portion I'm concerned with is ensuring that we

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

have an effective date on a Bill that we already passed by many votes earlier this Legislative Session. I ask for an 'aye' vote. It's extremely important. Here's what has happened in St. Clair County. What's happened is we have...we pass a Bill in this Legislature last spring. said the people of St. Clair County can decide whether they want to extend 'light rail' and pay for it themselves from St. Louis into St. Clair County. What we've neglected to do is put an effective date on this Bill, on that Bill. All this does is put an effective date. The Governor's is for it, the Minority Leader is for it, the Speaker of the House is for it, the Minority Leader and the Senate is for it, the Majority or the President of Senate is for it, everybody has signed the letter saying they're for this provision. We need 71 votes. The ballots are printed. It's going to be on the ballot November 2nd. Otherwise, what's going to happen is every single ballot we have printed in St. Clair County is going to have to be re-done. It's going to cost hundreds or thousands of dollars. All we're asking is that we get 71 votes. you."

Speaker McPike: "Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? The
Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 74
'ayes' and 41 'noes', and the House does adopt the First
Conference Committee Report to Senate Bill 707, and this
Bill, having received the Three-Fifths Constitutional
Majority, is hereby declared passed. Representative
Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to make a Motion regarding House Bill 1597."

Speaker McPike: "1597, Mr. Clerk."

Brunsvold: "1594, excuse me."

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Speaker McPike: "1594, Mr. Clerk."

Brunsvold: "Pursuant to Rule 77(a), I move to discharge the Committee on Ag. and Conservation and the Interim Study Calendar, further consideration on this Bill and suspend Rule 77(b) relating to the Calendar requirements and advance to the Order of Second Reading."

Speaker McPike: "All right, is there anyone in opposition to the Gentleman's Motion? No one in opposition the Gentleman's Motion, by use of the Attendance Roll Call, the All right, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill. Motion carries. right, on the Gentleman's Motion, the Chair is going to take a roll call on that. The question is, 'Shall Gentleman's Motion pass?' All in favor vote 'aye', opposed vote 'no'. Have all voted? Have all voted who wish? all voted who wish? Have all voted who wish? The Clerk will take the record. On this Motion, there are 102 'ayes' and 4 'noes' and 1 'present'. This is just a Motion to Discharge. 102 'ayes' and 4 'noes' and 1 voting 'present' and the Motion carries. All right, Mr. Clerk, do you the Bill yet? Please, Mr. Clerk, read the Bill."

Clerk McLennand: "House Bill 1594, offered by Representative Brunsvold, a Bill for an Act to amend the Wildlife Code.

Second Reading of the Bill. No Committee Amendments, no Motions filed. Floor Amendment #1 offered by Representative Giglio."

Speaker McPike: "Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative Giglio."

Speaker McPike: "Mr. Giglio."

Giglio: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. All Amendment #1 does is reduce the licenses from 5 to 4. There was one person that had it that passed away.

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

And what it does, it allows the four additional licenses to increase their perch quota and to be able to fish on Lake Michigan, and this Bill has been agreed upon with the Department of Conservation and those commercial fishermen, and I would ask for your support."

Speaker McPike: "The question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. The Amendment to 433 has been printed so we are going to return to that. Senate Bill 433. The Bill's been read a second time previously. Are there any Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #1, offered by Representative
Kaszak."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Kaszak."

Kaszak: "Mr. Speaker, the Amendment to Senate Bill 433 identical to House Bill 1162 which passed both the House and the Senate but it includes the Amendments that were presented by the Governor to House Bill 1162. current form, this Bill is approved and supported by the Chicago Bar Association, the Illinois State Bar Association, and the Illinois Trial Lawyers Association. It eliminates the problems that we've had with the Bill dealing with the retroactive impact of the Bill, and it deals with an unintended effect of extending the Statute of Limitations on manufacturers, so I would ask for it's approval."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Skinner."

Skinner: "Has this Amendment been on the desk for an hour? In fact, it just reached my desk, so I doubt it. I had to ask

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

for it specially."

Speaker McPike: "No, it has not been on your desk for an hour."

Skinner: "Well, since it hasn't, doesn't that mean we have to wait an hour?"

Speaker McPike: "No, it doesn't."

Skinner: "Why not?"

Speaker McPike: "Because that's not the rule. It only has to be on your desk for a second."

Skinner: "Well, it is nice of you to let it hit our desk at least."

Speaker McPike: "Yes. All right, the question is, 'Shall Amendment #1 be adopted?' All in favor say 'aye'; opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments."

Speaker McPike: "Third Reading. Adjournment Resolution."

Clerk McLennand: "House Joint Resolution #72 offered by Representative Currie. RESOLVED. BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, when both Houses adjourn on Wednesday, October 13, 1993, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, October 26, 1993, 12:00 o'clock noon."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Dart moves for the adoption of the Adjournment Resolution. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the Adjournment Resolution is adopted. Agreed Resolutions."

Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution 1447, offered by
Representative Deering; House Resolution 1448, offered by
Representative Black; House Resolution 1450, offered by
Representative Dart; House Resolution 1451, offered by
Representative Daniels; House Resolution 1453, offered by

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Representative Granberg; House Resolution 1454, offered by Representative Granberg; House Resolution 1455, offered by Representative Churchill; House Resolution 1457, offered by Representative Novak; House Resolution 1461, offered by Representative Hawkins; House Resolution 1462, offered by Representative Weller; House Resolution 1463, offered Representative Weller; House Resolution 1464, offered by Representative Weller; House Resolution 1465, offered Representative McAuliffe; House Resolution 1466, offered by Representative Giolitto; House Joint Resolution 70, offered by Representative Meyer; House Joint Resolution 71, offered by Representative Churchill; House Joint Resolution 73, offered by Representative Capparelli; House Joint Resolution 74, offered by Representative Wojcik; Joint Resolution 75, offered by Speaker Madigan; House Joint Resolution 76, offered by Representative Johnson, House Joint Resolution 77, offered by Representative Moore, Andrea."

Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi moves the adoption of the Agreed Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'.

The 'ayes' have it, and the Agreed Resolutions are adopted.

Death Resolutions. Representative Brunsvold."

Brunsvold: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd just like to remind the Body that when we come back on October 26th, that the Sportsmen's Caucus is having its first annual reception and auction. Those Caucus Members on the floor here and in the Senate, all one hundred of us, are donating items for the auction and door prizes and would remind everybody that we'd like to have them in attendance on the 26th at 6 o'clock over at the Hilton. So, remind your conservation people at home. They probably received invitations to please attend the reception and auction on the 26th of

- 85th Legislative Day October 13, 1993
  October when we come back on Tuesday. Thank you, Mr.
  Speaker."
- Clerk McLennand: "Death Resolutions. House Resolution 1452,
  offered by Representative Granberg, with respect to the
  memory of Dwight Friedrich. House Resolution 1459, offered
  by Representative Currie, with respect to the memory of
  Lewis Caldwell."
- Speaker McPike: "Representative Giorgi moves for the adoption of Death Resolutions. All in favor say 'aye'; opposed, 'no'.

  The 'ayes' have it, and the Death Resolutions are adopted.

  Now, we have about ten minutes of work yet. So, we should be out of here shortly. Representative Giglio in the Chair."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Chair would like to make an announcement.

  We're waiting for an Amendment on a Bill and we also have a

  Death Resolution on a former Member. Mr. Clerk, read the

  Resolution."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Resolution 1380, offered by Representative Daniels. WHEREAS, It is with deepest sorrow the House learned of the death of one of our most respected colleagues, Dwight Friedrich, who perished in an automobile accident; and WHEREAS, Dwight Friedrich served in the Illinois Senate from 1952 until 1964 and in Illinois House of Representatives from 1974 until 1986; and WHEREAS, He was а delegate to the 1970 Illinois Constitutional Convention and served as a delegate to Republican National Conventions in 1980 and 1984; and WHEREAS, He chaired the Republican Caucus in the House from 1980 until 1986 and chaired the House Rules Committee; he also served as a member of the Legislative Audit Commission and the Legislative Reference Bureau and WHEREAS, Born and raised on a farm in Marion Board;

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

County, Dwight Friedrich attending Brown's Business College, Southern Illinois University, and the University of Minnesota; and WHEREAS, He was a licensed real estate broker and insurance agent and president of the Friedrich Agency in Centralia; he served on the governing boards of the former Old National Bank and the Centralia Savings and Loan Association; and WHEREAS, Dwight Friedrich to his community by his active participation and membership in the American Legion, Shrine, Rotary Club, and First Baptist Church; and WHEREAS, The passing of Dwight Friedrich will be felt most deeply by his devoted family and friends who supported him throughout his public private career, especially his loving wife Virginia and his daughter Carol; therefore be it RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, that we express our most sincere condolences to the family of Dwight Friedrich, a friend and respected colleague whose wise counsel and advice will truly be missed; and be it further RESOLVED, That a suitable copy of this preamble and resolution be presented to Virginia Friedrich and family as the House of Representatives' tribute to fond friend, Dwight а Friedrich."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Daniels."

Daniels: "Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, Dwight
Friedrich was a force in Illinois politics since 1952.
When he started his career in Illinois Government with the
Illinois Senate and then later on in the Illinois House of
Representatives becoming the Caucus Chairman of the
Republican Party during the term that he served here. I
served with Dwight Friedrich from 1974 on and had the
pleasure of getting to know him not only as a man but as a

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

personality, as an individual, as one who believed strongly in the good forces of government and what it could do for I remember quite vividly many of Dwight's various moments, moments I think for the most part can summarized moments of excellence and moments as of compassion and understanding of what the people district wanted in a Legislator. He worked hard. self-made man. A person that we all could be proud of in the tradition of good people that rose in the ranks serve in public service in the most excellent of fashion. As those of you that served with him and knew him, strong in his beliefs, strong in his desires for good government and you never had any question whatsoever where Dwight Friedrich stood on an issue. And that's one of the reasons why he grew in that roll and became one of Republican Leaders on this side of the aisle. Because whenever we needed some advice, whenever we wanted to know happening in Central Illinois or Illinois, we could turn to Dwight and say, 'What do you think about this issue?' And you knew iust bv understanding his background, being born and raised on a farm in Marion County, he attended business college and went on to attend Southern Illinois University and University of Minnesota, and he used that business background and experience in his real estate business also in the Friedrich Agency in Centralia for insurance. And he was on the governing boards of many banks savings and loans throughout his career. So, he had a broad based background of knowledge in business, in banking, in S and L business and also in government. And I will tell you it was a real pleasure to serve with this man that we knew as Dwight Friedrich. His loss to us was

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

untimely as many are in these occasions. He died in an automobile accident and when I got the call, I was saddened by it, but remembered immediately so many good things about him, so many things that we will call upon in our years of service here in the General Assembly, those of us that the pleasure. So, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the with the fondest of memories, with all good wishes to his widow Virginia and Daughter Carol, we want to send to them our best wishes, our thanks for their sacrifice in allowing Dwight to be part of Illinois Government recognition that Dwight Friedrich represented all that's good in government, all that we, so many times, seek to portray in ourselves and for the people we represent. So, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, I'd like to add all Members of the House as Co-Sponsors, and we wish Dwight Godspeed and with fondest of memories."

Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor signify by saying 'aye';
opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes'
have it, and all Members will be Co-Sponsors.
Representative Stephens."

Stephens: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Dwight Friedrich will be missed by all of us. I remember when I first met him, qot involved in local politics in Caseyville Township and became the President of the Caseyville Township Republican Club and invited Dwight to come from Centralia to speak to us, he being a member of the old Fifty-Fifth Legislative District, from the three member districts. He drove all that way to Caseyville and the whole club showed up. were three of us there. There were not a Republicans in Caseyville Township, and I was embarrassed as their president, and Dwight Friedrich said to me, 'Young

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

man, don't worry about it. Self-government is a tough process, and I'm glad to be here tonight'. And he actually meant it. He informed the three of us about his opinions in a variety of aspects of government that night and I impressed with his willingness to share his time with us. I grew to admire Dwight Friedrich and his family. visited with them frequently in Virginia, used to worry about our children and the fact that raising their children in the process was one where the dad was away from home but, she and Dwight supported us and our family. Dwight Friedrich loved this process. When he was no longer active as a Legislator, you could see him in the back of the hall on many occasions and he would come and say encouraging words to those of us who were fighting battles that he found important. He will be deeply missed, sorely missed by our part of the state and I'm sure by the state as a whole. We wish his wife and family the best and Dwight, we will always miss you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Clinton, Representative Granberg."

Granberg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the I ran against Dwight in 1986 and we may have been House. on opposite sides of the aisle but during that process and the years before that and afterwards, I came to...my for him grew as time went on because as Ron said, Dwight believed in the process. He had great respect for this institution. Hе had great respect for the institutions of governments and what he did, he believed with his whole heart. And he did that, he represented our district with his whole heart. He represented his he represented his family and what he did, he believed in. And how often can you say that around here that we do what

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

we believe in all the time? And I've always respected Dwight for that. He worked hard for our area, and he did a heck of a job for our area and we will miss him in the process, our people will miss him, his family will certainly miss him, and they are wonderful, wonderful people, and I will miss him because we do have a lot of respect for the people who have worked here and have done the job they have done, and Dwight did it very well."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Lake, Representative Churchill."

Churchill: "I, too, rise to say a few words about Dwight. first came into the Legislature, Dwight sat behind me and was what we considered one of the old-timers in the legislative process, and I was fortunate because Т had people like Clarence Neff and Ralph Dunn and Dwight Friedrich around who would kind of watch over me and watch over those of us who came in as freshmen in that year. on many occasions, when I'd cast a vote or I'd make a I'd...a few minutes later I'd hear Dwight saying, 'Hey, Churchill, come here'. And then he'd give on what I'd just done either low-down correctly incorrectly and try and advise me from time to time on things to do and he was a great counsel, a great person to be a friend, and he knew so much about the legislative process. He had no fear to go against the common thread of things that were happening here and when we used to rise in those days to talk about what we're going to do for all the senior citizens, he would rise and talk about how good the senior citizens really had it and how we didn't really have to make special efforts on behalf of a lot of them. was not afraid to stand up and go counter to what was happening in this Body because of what he believed.

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

later years when he was in other capacities around here, he always stopped by to say 'hi' to his friends on the House floor. So, we surely will miss the guy. God bless you, Dwight."

- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Daniels now moves for the adoption of the Resolution. All those in favor signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Resolution is adopted. On page 1, the Supplemental Calendar #1 appears Senate Bill 87. Eight seven. Read the Bill, Mr. Clerk."
- Clerk McLennand: "Senate Bill 87, offered by Representative
  Burke. The Bill's been read a second time previously
  today. No Committee Amendments. Floor Amendment #1,
  offered by Representative Ostenburg."
- Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Ostenburg."
- Ostenburg: "Mr. Speaker, I move to withdraw Amendment #1."
- Speaker Giglio: "Withdraw Amendment #1. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #2, offered by Representative
  Ostenburg."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Ostenburg on Amendment #2."
- Ostenburg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Ladies and Gentlemen of the House, this Amendment is an effort to correct something that happened in the closing days of the regular Session. At that time, there was a position created as a Superintendent of Schools in suburban Cook County. This was an action that was taken after we had earlier eliminated the position of Cook County Superintendent of Education. Well, we are moving in this Amendment is to discontinue that action so that we will not have a position of Superintendent in the suburban area of Cook County. Now, as somebody who has spent his entire adult life in

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

education, I've had a lot of contact with various superintendents and educational administrators, and I can tell you that in the Cook County region, there was nothing that more on the mind of various educational was administrators then to do away with the position of Regional Superintendent of Schools in Cook County. matter of fact, there were often candidates from the other side of the aisle, Republicans running for Superintendent of Education who made the promise that if elected, their major purpose after being elected would be to make sure that this position was eliminated. In 1982, 1992 rather, the position was eliminated, and now in 1993, we have mistakenly recreated a new position. I'd like to point out that it's a \$1.8 million budget that was given to the Regional Superintendent of Education in Cook County. That's mostly money that's being paid by taxpayers in Cook County. \$1.4 million of that came from the property tax in Cook County. This is an unnecessary position, mistake to create it, and I urge the support of this Amendment to do away with this unnecessary position in educational ranks. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Kubik."

Kubik: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Gentleman yield for a question or two?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Kubik: "Representative, your intent is to abolish an office, the Office of the Regional Superintendent, which was reinstated by legislative action earlier this year, correct?"

Ostenburg: "That's correct."

Kubik: "Okay. What I don't understand is your Amendment. The way the Amendment reads, I think it doesn't do what you

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

want it to do. I could be reading this Amendment incorrectly. What the Amendment says is, under Section 7, the Regional Superintendent of Schools, let's see...so, what we're going to do, okay...now, I'm reading the Amendment, I think what you're going to do is eliminate the Cook County portion and leave the rest of the legislation alone, is that correct?"

Ostenburg: "That's correct."

Kubik: "So, that the agreement that was made which consolidated a lot of the other regions will remain in effect?"

Ostenburg: "That's right, that is not affected at all."

Kubik: "Okay, and the only person or office we are going to eliminate is in Cook County, suburban Cook County?"

Ostenburg: "That's right."

Kubik: "Good Amendment. I support the Amendment."

Ostenburg: "Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Cook, Representative Lang."

Lang: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "He indicates he will."

Lang: "Representative Ostenburg, Representative Ostenburg. I just want to make sure I understand this. I was the Sponsor of the Bill a couple of years ago to abolish this office and then we by legislative action, apparently recreated it this year. Is that correct?"

Ostenburg: "That's correct."

Lang: "And would this Bill, this Amendment then take it back, at least in Cook County, to what we did two years ago, the Bill that I sponsored?"

Ostenburg: "That's right."

Lang: "Thank you. To the Bill, to the Amendment, Mr. Speaker, I strongly endorse this Amendment. When we abolished this office two years ago, we did the right thing. We did it on

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

an overwhelming vote because the office was a waste, the office was unnecessary, the office was spending a lot of money. We don't need this office. For...to not vote for this is to say that we're going to add layers of government and bureaucracy we don't need, to spend money we don't have, and at a time when we're in a fiscal crisis all over the State of Illinois, it would be irresponsible for us to add layers of government that cost further dollars, particularly unnecessary ones. So, I would strongly urge an 'aye' vote."

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Kane, Representative Hoeft."

Hoeft: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield, please?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Hoeft: "The question comes down to whether, in fact, this office is going to serve the school districts in this State. House Bill 555 went through, Cook County was excluded. There was such a cry from the superintendents of Cook County that the Senators put that back in. \$1.8 million is service, and understand, if you vote to abolish that office, the State is going to have to pick up that service and the State is going to have to pay the bill, the \$1.8 million for the Cook County services. consistency, that's what we passed, a regional school office throughout the whole state. This is what the school districts have asked for in Cook County and if you vote for this, you're voting against your school districts. I strongly urge you to vote against this Amendment. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "Further discussion? Further discussion? Representative Ostenburg to close."

Ostenburg: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to the last speaker, I'd like to point out that the responsibilities

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

held by the Regional Superintendent of that had been Schools in Cook County have been transferred to the State Board of Education. The State Board of Education collects the three areas of responsibility that fees for conducts. Ιt provides for GED testing. It provides for transportation safety and it provides for teachers' In all three certification. of those areas, fees are collected to provide for the costs that are involved. We're not talking here about transferring costs. talking, in fact, about savings taxpayers' dollars. Rather than \$1.8 million being spent on an office, 1.4 million of which comes from Cook County taxpayers and only 400,000 of that came from the State of Illinois. Instead, we're transferring it to the State Board of Education, a more efficient operation where fees will be collected to pay for the costs involved in these three elements. Anyone interested in efficient government, in good government and in cost savings must support this Amendment. I urge votes. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Amendment, signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"

Clerk McLennand: "Floor Amendment #3 offered by Representative Levin."

Speaker Giglio: "Representative Levin."

Levin: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker, Ladies and Gentlemen of the House. Amendment #3 is House Bill 2105 as it was originally introduced. It simply codifies the authority of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board to promulgate rules and regulations with respect to reimbursements for special education. This is identical to 2105 as it was

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

originally introduced and, therefore, is in conformity with what the Governor recommended be done with House Bill 2105 when he sent it back. If there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer them. Otherwise, you know, 2105 initially passed the House with 112 to nothing vote and passed the Senate 52 to nothing."

Speaker Giglio: "Any discussion? The Gentleman from Vermilion, Representative Black."

Black: "Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Will the Sponsor yield?"

Speaker Giglio: "Indicates he will."

Black: "Representative, I haven't had a chance to read Amendment #3 very carefully, but anytime I see language about cost and payment for special education, I realize how expensive that can be to local school districts. Could you enlighten me as to whether or not we are making additional costs or putting additional cost burden on the local school district or how are these services to be paid for? I guess that's what I'm after."

Levin: "Okay. Representative, you know, first let me indicate that the Governor...there are two parts to 2105 when went to the Governor. The Governor indicated he had no problem with what is here now. He did have a problem with Amendment that was added by Representative Granberg, which changed, I believed changed the school aid formula with respect to his district. So, the Governor sent the Bill back with the Granberg provision eliminated. was a finding on the part of the Speaker's Council that that Amendatory Veto did not comply with the rules of and so this is identical to what the Governor had recommended be left in House Bill 2105. It was drafted originally by the Executive Director of the Governor's

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

Purchase Care Review Board and all it does is to codify the authority of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board with respect to the promulgation of rules and regulations with respect to reimbursement of special education. It makes, you know, no substantive changes. It went through hearings in the House and in the Senate and enjoyed full support. I hope that answers your question."

Black: "Alright. Thank you very much, Representative. One additional question, if the Purchase Review Board places a student from, say, one of my school districts and the expensive or the expense of that exceeds the tuition cost at that school district, is there a stock loss in this? I mean does my school district have to assume, say, a \$14,000 residency cost if the tuition in my district is only \$4,000? I mean is this...I guess what I'm after is what may determine the cost, and does the local school district have to pay that cost without any recourse or hearing?"

Levin: "Representative this, you know, makes no substantive changes as far as what gets what type of thing gets reimbursed and what doesn't. It just provides the authority for rules and regulations. So, it has no effect on the situation that you raise."

Black: "All right, so in other words, it doesn't change the existing language, but I think there is some concern on part of many school districts throughout the State that some of these placements are far, far above the cost that they would expend in their own school district to provide similar services."

Levin: "Yeah, you know, I think that's an issue for another day."

Black: "All right."

Levin: "This does not deal at all with the formula for getting reimbursement. It simply deals with the authority...it

85th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

comes from the Attorney General opinion, comes with the authority of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board to promulgate rules and regulations."

Black: "Well, perhaps that we could revisit that formula on another day, as you say. Thank you very much."

Speaker Giglio: "The Lady from Sangamon, Representative Moseley." Moseley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Amendment. As Representative Levin has already mentioned, legislation passed out of this House on a Consent It was looked at in Education Committee. I think you also need to understand, and there may be some confusion on this, this is simply putting into statute the process that the policy that had been unwritten and had been in use for all the years past, it's only been in one instance that we have not followed this, and it was so much the policy that when it came time to talk to that one school district and it was discovered the law was silent. that's when it was a cooperative effort of the Governor's Purchase Care Review Board, the Attorney General's Office, the State Board of Education and all parties involved, that it was decided to put it in statute. That's why it has received unanimous support, and I ask that you give it the

Speaker Giglio: "The Gentleman from Champaign, Representative Tim Johnson."

Johnson, Tim: "I move the previous guestion."

same consideration today. Thank you."

Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'; opposed 'no', and the previous question has been moved.

Representative Levin to close."

Levin: "I simply ask for your favorable vote on Amendment #3."

Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Amendment signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'no'. In the opinion of the Chair,

85th Legislative Day

- October 13, 1993
- the 'ayes' have it. The Amendment's adopted. Further Amendments?"
- Clerk McLennand: "No further Amendments, but a fiscal note request has been filed for this Bill as amended."
- Speaker Giglio: "Fiscal note's been filed. We'll leave the Bill on Third...on Second Reading. Edley, for what purpose do you rise, Sir?"
- Edley: "Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There will be a joint hearing of the Appropriations Committee on Monday, October the 25th at 11:00 in room 114 in the State Capitol Building. We will be discussing the Supplemental Appropriations."
- Speaker Giglio: "Representative Currie now moves that the House stand adjourned until the hour of 12:00 on Tuesday, October 26th. All those in favor, signify by saying 'aye'; opposed, 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the House now stands adjourned until Tuesday at 12:00 on October 26th."

### FIRST SPECIAL SESSION

18th Legislative Day

October 13, 1993

- Speaker Giglio: "First Special Session of the 88th General Assembly will now come to order. Representative Currie now moves that the Roll Call for the Regular Session stand and be used for the Attendance Roll Call for the First Special Session of the 88th General Assembly. Resolutions."
- Clerk McLennand: "House Joint Resolution #2 of the First Special Session offered by Representative Currie. RESOLVED, BY THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EIGHTY-EIGHTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS, AT THE FIRST SPECIAL SESSION THEREOF, THE SENATE CONCURRING HEREIN, that when both Houses adjourn on Wednesday, October 13, 1993, they stand adjourned until Tuesday, October 26, 1993, at 12:00 o'clock noon."
- Speaker Giglio: "All those in favor of the Resolution signify by saying 'aye', opposed 'nay'. In the opinion of the Chair, the 'ayes' have it, and the first Resolution is adopted. Representative Currie now moves that the First Special Session stand adjourned until 12:05 Tuesday, October 26th. All those in favor say 'aye', opposed 'no'. The 'ayes' have it, and the First Special Session is now adjourned. Twenty-six...Tuesday, the 26th of October. General Session and First Special Session are now adjourned."

REPURT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

# STATE OF ILLINOIS 88TH GENERAL ASSEMULY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX

#### 94/02/03 12:17:42

UCTOBER 13. 1993

|          | UCTUBER 13, 1993   |              |          |  |
|----------|--------------------|--------------|----------|--|
| H0317    | MOTION             | PAGE         | 2        |  |
| H5-0392  | MOTION             | PAGE         | 43       |  |
| H3-0467  | MOTION             | PAGE         | 39       |  |
| H -06.9  | MOTION             | PAGE .       | 37       |  |
| H3-1256  | MOTION             | PAGE         | 23       |  |
| H3-1377  | MOTION             | PAGE         | 42       |  |
|          | HOTION             | PAGE         | 3 v      |  |
|          | MOTION             | PAGE         | 4        |  |
|          | SECOND READING     | PAGE         | 52       |  |
|          | MOTION             | PAGE         | 51       |  |
|          | MOTION             | PAG⊢         | 26       |  |
|          | MOTION             | PAGE         | 30       |  |
|          | MOTION             | PAGE         | 6        |  |
|          | MOTION             | PAGE         | 46       |  |
|          | NOTION             | PAGE         | 3 €      |  |
|          | FIRST READING      | PAGE         | 2        |  |
|          | FIRST READING      | PAGE         | 2        |  |
|          | FIRST READING      | PASE         | 2        |  |
|          | FIRST READING      | PAGE         | 2        |  |
|          | SECOND READING     | PAGE         | 62       |  |
|          | HELD ON SELOND     | PAGE         | 70       |  |
|          | RECALLED           | PAGE         | 9        |  |
|          | SECOND READING     | PAGE         | 9        |  |
|          | MOTION             | PAGE         | 14       |  |
|          | SECUND READING     | PAGE         | 53       |  |
|          | OUT OF RECORD      | PAGE         | 10       |  |
|          | SECOND READING     | PAGE         | 11       |  |
|          | SECOND READING     | PAG <i>E</i> | 12       |  |
|          | RECALLED           | PAGE         | 12       |  |
|          | CONFERENCE         | PAGE         | 20       |  |
|          | OUT OF RECOKD      | PAGE         | 23       |  |
|          | FIRST READING      | PAGE         | 13       |  |
|          | ADOPTED            | PAGE         | 62       |  |
|          | RESULUTION OFFERED | PAGE         | 56       |  |
|          | ADOPTED            | PAGE         | 54<br>54 |  |
| M3K-00/2 | RESOLUTION OFFERED | PAGE         | 54       |  |
|          |                    |              |          |  |

## SUJJECT MATTER

| HOUSE TO ORDER - REPRESENTATIVE MCPIKE | PAGE | L  |
|--|------|----|
| PRAYER - KEVEREND CARL MARSHALL        | PAGE | 1  |
| PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE                   | PAGE | 1  |
| ROLL CALL FOR ATTENDANCE               | PAGE | 1  |
| COMMITTEE REPORTS                      | PAGE | 1  |
| AGREED RESOLUTIONS                     | PAGE | 54 |
| DEATH RESOLUTIONS ¢ ¢ ¢ ¢              | PAGE | 56 |
| REPRESENTATIVE GIGLIO IN CHAIR         | PAGÉ | 56 |
| THEKNUOLGA                             | PAGÉ | 70 |

REPORT: TIFLDAY PAGE: 001

# STATE OF ILLINOIS BBTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES DAILY TRANSCRIPTION OF DEBATE INDEX SPECIAL SESSION OF 1

94/02/03 12:17:42

OCTOBER 13: 1993

| HJR-0002 | ADOPTED    |         | PAGE | 1 |
|----------|------------|---------|------|---|
| HJR-0002 | RESOLUTION | OFFERED | PAGE | 1 |

SUBJECT MATTER

| FIRST SPECIAL SESSION TO ORDER       | PAGE | 1 |
|--------------------------------------|------|---|
| ADJOURNMENT OF FIRST SPECIAL SESSION | PAGE | 1 |